



Charles Holbrook Library
Pacific School of Religion
1798 Scenic Ave.
Berkeley 9, Calif.

The official position of the Federation is to open the eyes of the people to the social and economic conditions of the world, and to note social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without special class or group discriminations and privileges.

Social Questions Bulletin

VOLUME 41

DECEMBER, 1951

NUMBER 9

AHAB, THE VINEYARD, AND THE SYRIANS: AN OLD STORY RETOLD

By CLIFFORD J. DURR*

Once there was a king of Israel, Ahab, not very good, but still, as kings went, perhaps not so bad either.

With his big, beautiful palace and garden, you might think Ahab happy, but in those days the more kings had the more they wanted. The king kept thinking his big garden would be even more beautiful if only a little bigger.

A vineyard right next door was owned by Naboth, and Ahab thought, "If I had it, I could dig up the grape vines and plant herbs and flowers instead and my garden would be much more beautiful."

Ahab told Naboth, "I will swap you a much better vineyard—or, I'll pay you for it." Naboth replied he was sorry, but it was a good vineyard, and he liked it. Besides, it had been in the family a long time and was not for sale.

Ahab was so disappointed he went to his bedroom and pouted.

The queen went up to see why Ahab hadn't come down to dinner. She asked him why he was pouting and he told her.

"What kind of a king are you anyway," asked the queen, "letting a lout like Naboth tell you where to get off."

"And besides," said Jezebel, "what will happen to the Israel-form-of-government-and-way-of-life if a man can say he would rather have a vineyard than money and get away with it? You leave it to me and I'll show you how to get that vineyard!"

So the queen wrote up an executive order and signed the king's name to it, charging Naboth with blasphemy against God and Ahab, and ordering the nobles to set up a loyalty hearing and to try Naboth right away.

Now, Naboth hadn't committed blasphemy against God, or Ahab, or anybody else. All he had done was to refuse to sell his vineyard. But that didn't bother Jezebel. She just sent for a couple of professional witnesses who were sons of Belial, and, no nicer than she; and she hired them as witnesses for the prosecution and told them what to say.

The good people of Israel did not know these witnesses were sons of Belial, but thought they were experts on subversive activities. So when the people heard them testify under oath that Naboth was guilty of blasphemy against God and Ahab, they were very angry; for to say a man was guilty of blasphemy against God and Ahab was like saying he was an atheistic communist and didn't believe in the Israeli-form-of-government-and-way-of-life. So the people took Naboth out and stoned him until his blood ran out on the ground and he died. And the dogs licked up his blood.

Ahab was very happy. He would not only get the vineyard but wouldn't have to pay for it. So he rushed right down to take it over and start digging up the vines. But there he found Elijah, a preacher, waiting for him. Elijah told him he acted badly in treating Naboth as he did, and God was angry with him—so angry, God was going to punish him, and his wife and children. The dogs were going to lick up his blood right where they had licked up the blood of Naboth.

Ahab cried and said he was sorry he had acted so badly, and he would never behave that way again—and you can hardly blame him because it isn't pleasant to get killed and have the dogs lick up your blood.

Elijah finally told him if he was truly sorry, God wouldn't kill him at all, but only his wife and children. With that, Ahab stopped crying and was soon quite cheerful again.

He soon forgot how scared he had been. After all, he had Naboth's vineyard; and it made his garden look much nicer. He began to think his kingdom would be nicer, too, if only a little bigger. He decided Ramoth-gilead was just what he needed.

However, it wasn't as easy to take over Ramoth-gilead as Naboth's vineyard because Ramoth-gilead was owned by a country called Syria and Ahab couldn't very well try the king of Syria for not believing in the Israel-form-of-government-and-way-of-life because the king of Syria wasn't supposed to believe in the Israel-form-of-government-and-way-of-life, but only in the Syrian-form-of-government-and-way-of-life. Besides, Syria had a big army, and kings with big armies don't just let other people take them to court and try them if they can help it.

Ahab decided to take over Ramoth-gilead he had better get some help, so he took the matter up with his cousin Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. Jehoshaphat said blood was thicker than water and he believed in kinfolk sticking together, but he didn't like a war until he was sure he knew what he was getting into.

"You are exactly right," said Ahab. "I believe in being careful, too. I have the finest group of experts on the Syrian situation you can find. We shall consult them before making a move."

So Ahab called his 400 experts—except that in those days experts were called "prophets." Maybe Ahab's experts knew all there was to know about the Syrian situation, and maybe not, but they did know a while back other experts told Ahab some things he didn't want to hear and some had been killed and a hundred others had lost their jobs and had to hide in caves with nothing to eat but bread and water. And, of course, it would not have been very patriotic to say that the army of Israel couldn't whip the army of Syria. So, when Ahab asked, "Shall I go against Ramoth-gilead to battle?" all four hundred replied, "Go up; for the Lord shall deliver it."

Jehoshaphat asked Ahab if there weren't some other experts around to be consulted. Ahab told him there was Micaiah, but he wasn't much of an expert because he was always giving advice a king didn't like. Jehoshaphat thought they'd better hear Micaiah. So Ahab sent a messenger to get Micaiah.

The messenger told Micaiah what the other experts had said and advised him to say the same thing if he knew what was good for him. So when Ahab asked, "Shall we go against Ramoth-gilead to battle?" Micaiah replied like the rest, "Go and prosper; for the Lord shall deliver it."

Ahab didn't want Jehoshaphat to get the idea he was telling his experts what they should say, so he told Micaiah he wanted the truth and no guff.

"All right," said Micaiah, "If you go against Ramoth-gilead, you will get licked, so if you don't want your army scattered over the hills, you'd better keep it at home and enjoy peace."

So Ahab ordered Micaiah beaten and thrown into jail and fed nothing but bread and water. Then he marched against Ramoth-gilead and got licked just as Micaiah said, and got an arrow through his ribs and died—and the dogs licked up his blood after all.

I said Ahab wasn't so bad as kings went in those days but I was wrong, because the Bible says he did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the Kings of Israel before him.

Anyway, aren't we glad we aren't ruled over by stupid kings like Ahab anymore, and that we have freedom of speech so our experts are not afraid to say what they think and we won't ever go against Ramoth-gilead or any place like that and get ourselves into trouble as Ahab and the Israelites did?

GIVE THE BULLETIN FOR CHRISTMAS!

The Social Questions Bulletin—

Works for peace and good will among men—in every issue. Spotlights ignored facts contributing to that end.

So why not give your friends the Bulletin for Christmas?

Make your Christmas gifts count for peace and good will. \$2 per year. \$1 for six months. \$5 for three years.

* Former Member, Federal Communications Commission, and Counsel, National Farmers Union, Episcopal Layman.

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

To find the motivation behind the Acheson-Truman disarmament plan one did not have to read beyond the headlines. They proclaimed it an attempt to take the initiative for peace away from the Soviet Union. This showed the plan to be cut from the same pattern that dismissed Soviet proposals for peace, and worldwide demands for the outlawry of atomic and other mass murder weapons with adequate controls and for a peace pact between the Big Five, as deceptive propaganda. The proposal is an attempt to gain propaganda advantage. That reveals the moral level on which our present policy makers handle the destiny-charged issue of war or peace.

At a date when the first drafts of Truman's speech were already written the Acting Secretary of State "flatly denied" to Reston of the N. Y. Times "that any such specific disarmament plan was being prepared." Three days later, evidently by design, the plan was announced in Paris by the French foreign minister as a new "sensational" approach to peace. Washington promptly called it "a serious diplomatic effort to end the cold war." From a weighty section of the press the reaction was that the plan was neither sensational nor new, and without promise of effectiveness except as propaganda.

All of it, and more too, was defined by Acheson at the University of California in March, said Reston. The Washington Post described it as mainly "a play to the gallery . . . an intolerable way to conduct foreign policy because it confuses propaganda with statesmanship." "Stale," says the N. Y. Tribune and "scarcely designed for acceptance." Because it applies to conventional as well as atomic weapons the Baruch plan, already rejected by the Soviet Union, the Washington Star thinks it naive to expect Moscow to accept it and that Truman has no illusions on that score. The London Times suggests "that if ever a system of international control could be established it might be nearer to the Russian plan than to the arrangement proposed by Mr. Baruch."

These journalists know what is hidden from most of our newspaper readers, that the deadlock in atomic discussions is not over inspection but over the Lillenthal-Baruch vesting of ownership and management of all atomic resources and plants in an international commission. Thus the peaceful use of atomic energy by those nations whose life is based on a socialist economy would be at the mercy of the capitalist majority-dominated, when it does not act automatically, by the cartellized U. S., as the U. N. record shows. This the Soviet Union has just said again it will never accept. Nor would we were the situation reversed. Consequently our one concession, acceptance of previous Soviet demands to include the new mass murder weapons in all disarmament discussions, is cancelled out by insistence on the Baruch plan.

This outcome is made doubly certain by the technique of that plan. The first move is to demand agreement on means before ends are decided. With the bomb, inspection and control before outlawry. With disarmament, census before amount and kind of disarming. The supporting move is to propose a series of steps, indefinite as to time and outcome. Meantime we increase our advantage—the stockpiling, the bases encircling the Soviet Union, the rearming of Germany and Japan. This is not a serious attempt to end the cold war but another move in that war. The object in presenting something the Soviet Union will not accept is to be able again to accuse it of wanting peace only in words. If the move succeeds then more oil has been poured on the fires of anti-communist suspicion, fear and hate; we are nearer war not peace.

The answer to the kindred questions of the practical and moral worth of this proposal lies still deeper. From Paris Ann O'Hare McCormick of the N. Y. Times writes that inside the Assembly Hall they argue about disarmament, but outside their talk is all about armament. How can a policy which depends upon rearmament for its realization begin real disarmament? If you rely on force to achieve your ends when do you have enough positions of strength to secure submission to your demands? What do you do if you can't get them? Increasingly the peoples of the world are demanding an end to war, disarmament and peaceful co-existence. Our cold war allies are growing suspicious, restless and resentful. Our rearmament program is seriously undermining their economic health, yet our economic interest in war increases. Meantime the passions that incite to war grow with the armaments. Witness the demand to use the atomic stockpile that followed the loose charges of massacre of war prisoners in Korea. An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit.

Will sections of the Protestant pulpit, individual and collective, that have supported, condoned, or silently and reluctantly accepted the policy that requires rearmament see in time that the only policy which can further the moral values of their religion is one whose nature requires disarmament?

H. F. W.

GEORGE ALBERT COE

By HARRY F. WARD

One of our first members, Prof. George A. Coe, passed away quietly in his sleep in the early morning of Nov. 9, in his 90th year, at his home in Claremont, Calif. On Nov. 8 his last printed word appeared in the Christian Advocate in a letter out of its Mailbag from the student who, with rare understanding, has been handling his correspondence since his disability. "When I read the news item on the Methodist Federation for Social Action (see the issue of Sept. 20) to Prof. George A. Coe, who is not strong any more, he said: 'In my opinion, no organization has followed the radicalism of Jesus more consistently nor more courageously than the Methodist Federation for Social Action.'"

Joined to the recent loss of Winifred Chappell, for whose labors and devotion he had the greatest appreciation and for her capacities the greatest respect, the death of Prof. Coe makes a big gap in the thinning line of those who have labored together in this cause for many years. He was, I think, the last of a group of distinguished leaders who long ago pledged \$100 a year. He was enthusiastically with us in every advance, from concern with community service to the labor struggle, then to the social order, and in the Great Depression to the moral nature of its economic base. Under fire he was always for no retreat, and his counsel on strategy was always helpful—in the attacks that followed our Bulletin on the infant Soviet Union, our affiliation with the American League for Peace and Democracy, our refusal to be intimidated by the smearing tactics of the current witch hunters. His last communication with the office concerned the likelihood of success for the proposal at the recent Annual Meeting to trim down our masthead statement of purpose. To this he was unalterably opposed.

The combination of keenness of mind with strength of moral conviction that made him so valuable to our cause brought Prof. Coe to authoritative leadership and worldwide influence in the field of religious education and the psychology of religion. The son of a Methodist minister, he held a B.S.T. degree from Boston University and also a Ph.D. under Borden P. Bowne, whom he occasionally delighted to quote. One I have sometime had use for. The student: "But professor it must be either or." The professor: "Young man, usually it is both and. It is in the crises that it has to be either or." To the influence of his four successive professorships, with three others as visiting professor, he added that of his dozen books. They united the scientific approach to the study of religion with the imperative of the moral emotions, from his early volume on "The Spiritual Life" to his last on "What Is Religion Doing to Our Conscience?"

Always joining theory and action, in 1925, Prof. Coe was Chairman of a Citizens Committee of 100 in New York to combat discrimination by the Board of Education against three teachers, union members, charged with left wing politics. As Chairman of the Committee on Militarism in Education, in 1928 he asked Presidential Candidates to state their views on compulsory military drill in colleges, and in 1932 presented a petition to the House Military Affairs Committee, signed by 327 college presidents, professors and educators, urging "withdrawal of the War Department from the field of education."

To this man I owe much, first as his student and later his colleague. In more than fifty years of friendship we worked and counselled together. When disagreement came, as come it will, it meant not defense of positions but search for more truth. Lately we have had two joint concerns: the moral decline of Protestantism that set in after the war; the nature and challenge of Marxist philosophy. Last year he wrote: "I have known only a few of my Christian friends to recognize the truth that what is splitting the world is the ethical core of Marxism, not the political system that has developed in Russia." To my question could I quote him he answered: "Quote as much as you like! For we are not done with Marxism when we weigh the merits and demerits of the Soviet government, nor when we choose between the communist and the anti-communist ideology. Marx raised the fundamental ethical question whether it is humane or just that a man's sustenance should depend upon his contributing by his labor to the private profit of another. This ethical core of Marxism is being ignored by both the political and the ecclesiastical thought that is most characteristic of the United States today."

(Continued from page 36)

For realistic appraisal of the degree of war preparation (or arming) of the rival camps—account should be taken not only of the major rivals, U. S. A. and the U.S.S.R., but of their allies. When this is done the discrepancy (in favor of the U. S. and its allies) is considerably more marked, according to the U. N. tables. As listed allies of the U.S.S.R. we can count Czechoslovakia and Poland which respectively in 1951 (according to this UN statistical table 67) expend 170 and 450 thousand man years in defense expenditure (13 and 18 man years per thousand inhabitants). Comparable figures for Western nations allied with us are: England—4200 or 82 per thousand inhabitants; France—2200 or 51 per thousand inhabitants; Yugoslavia 575 or 35 per thousand inhabitants; Italy 1350 or 29 per thousand inhabitants, etc. Of all the nations listed, by far the largest 1951 defense expenditure in man-years per thousand inhabitants is that of England (82) with the U. S. coming second (74), France third (51), Netherlands fourth (46), and the U.S.S.R. fifth (49). At bottom in defense expenditure in man-years per thousand inhabitants is Czechoslovakia (13), with Denmark second (17 by preliminary estimate), and Poland third (18).

Does not such a report from a Western oriented U. N. Commission give serious pause to the self-styled "realists" who would justify our colossal arms spending and that into which we have pressured our allies?

U. S. Arms Spending Questioned by General Motors President

Charles E. Wilson, President of General Motors (the world's largest corporation) warned the Society for Advancement of Management on October 10 against "expanding the military program beyond the minimum needed to defend the country," to the point where "our over-arming may lead to war, by giving Russia a genuine fear for her security." Mr. Wilson added: "It would be tragic indeed . . . if we over-do military preparedness and are at least partly responsible for precipitating a third World War." Mr. Wilson quoted an editorial from the Detroit News: "It was never intended that we would confront the Communist world with preponderant power, or project a program of armament which in the immediate future might give Russia genuine fears of her security. . . . This nation cannot live for long in peace, or in relative prosperity, once it is converted into an armed camp. Either it will be beggared by the cost of military upkeep, and the starving of the supply to its civilian economy will promote depression and political demoralization, or to ward off these evils, we will take the road to war, even as Hitler did."

This threat that our economy might develop a stake in war is also indicated in the authoritative new Harpers publication "The United Nations and Power Politics," which is at points critical of both the U. S. and the U.S.S.R., but which states (Page 182): "With a third of their national budget in military expenditure, Americans would face economic chaos if that expenditure were suddenly cut by anything like the figure proposed by the Soviet Government. On the other hand a similar freeing of funds from military expenditure in the U.S.S.R. would send that country swiftly upward in economic strength. Can anyone doubt that these facts influence national policy in the United States? The question is rhetorical."

Will Our Russian Rivals Launch the War For Which We Prepare?

On October 27 at Hot Springs the State Department briefed the 100 member Business Advisory Group of the Department of Commerce as follows: "Russia shows no sign of readiness to start World War III. . . . The U. S. A. and its Allies outproduce the Soviet bloc three or four to one in goods of war potential."

According to the well-informed, but highly conservative "U. S. News and World Report" in its November 2 issue, the total atomic war for which we prepare is *not* the war being waged even now by our Russian rivals—nor a war which they either desire or will start: "U. S., arming, is getting set for an imaginary war of the kind Russia will avoid at almost any cost."

"War that U. S. prepares for would blow up much of the world, if started. Nobody wins, all lose, that war. . . . War preparation, U. S. style, aimed at some imaginary war that Russia will not fight unless attacked, is geared to yield disaster for all. Its aim, as officially outlined, is to leave the world a shambles that nobody but a Communist would want to try to run."

"If the U. S. style war is not fought, there is the prospect of economic disaster when preparation for that imaginary war slows. Communists plan to be around to pick up the pieces. . . . U. S., slow on the up-take, its officials bewildered by new style war, is back on its heels, out of ideas, able to think of nothing but armament for the imaginary war that Communists are determined not to fight. The one-track strategy of present American planners calls for getting armed to the teeth. . . ."

"The United States, leading industrial power of the world, at this point admittedly remains on the defensive, outsmarted, outmaneuvered at every turn. Everything is geared to the one-track idea of a war to blow up the world. . . ."

"As things are going now, U. S., arming to the teeth, is losing. Russia, without committing troops of her own, is winning with ideas, propaganda, and revolution."

The Gospel's Practical Relevance Methodist Peace Commission's Proposals

Such facts, such warnings, lend practicality to Gospel-rooted efforts of religious groups like M.F.S.A. to secure new policies for peace and multi-lateral disarmament.

They lend weight to the resolutions just passed by our official Methodist Peace Commission which refer "with great distress and alarm" to "the present gigantic expenditures for military weapons in many countries," expenditures which bring higher taxes, wasted natural resources, and a shortage of consumer goods "when two-thirds of the world is hungry and in need." The Commission called on "Christians in all lands to work with tremendous earnestness for universal and simultaneous disarmament during the crucial year of 1952."

Steps recommended by the Commission include: (1) A "limited but adequate UN police force." (2) Continuous UN arms inspection. (3) Adoption of some equitable standard to determine arms necessary for national security. (4) An absolute ban on all weapons of mass destruction, atomic bombs, guided missiles, germ warfare. (5) Church cultivation of the "spiritual foundations of peace."

UMT and Militarization

The Peace Commission took the traditional Methodist stand against Universal Military Training. The degree of our militarization—both ideological and physical—will vastly increase if proposals for permanent U.M.T. are adopted. Obviously also this would effect further breakdown in personal and social morality with marked increases in the already menacing degree of drunkenness and prostitution. Have you let your Congressman and Senators (and the President) hear from you on this subject during this Congressional recess? The time for action is *now!*

What About Jesus and Christmas?

What would happen if in this Christmas Season we would listen again to Jesus who came not for Operation Killer—but for life and life abundant, for all men everywhere? When governments arm for war and some leaders talk of peace—what if we listen to One who in his greatest Sermon twenty centuries ago, said that men in all times would be known not by their propaganda words, but by their fruits, records, deeds? And what if in this Christmas Season we took seriously the Christmas Story? "The day-spring from on high shall visit us, To shine upon them in darkness and the shadow of death, To guide our feet into peace." "Ye shall find the babe in a manger. Glory to God, and on earth peace, good will toward men." "Blessed are the peacemakers: they shall be called Sons of God." "The people in darkness have seen a great light: They in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. Thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor. Every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire. For unto us a child is born, a son is given: and his name shall be called Prince of Peace." "And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations; they shall beat their swords into plowshares, spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither learn war any more. They shall sit every man under his vine and fig tree; none shall make them afraid: The Lord of Hosts hath spoken it." "Saith Jesus, All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." "Woe to them that go down to Egypt (to military alliances and pacts) for help; and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are strong; but look not unto the Holy One, neither seek the Lord!"

J. R. M.

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year

25c per copy

Issued monthly, except July, August and September
METHODIST FEDERATION for SOCIAL ACTION
(Unofficial)

Executive Secretary and Editor—JACK R. McMICHAEL

President: Bishop Francis J. McConnell; Vice Presidents: Bishop J. W. E. Bowen, Dr. Dillon W. Throckmorton, Rev. Edgar Wahlberg; Recording Sec.: Rev. Sumpter M. Riley, Jr.; Treas.: Rev. Lee H. Ball; Asst. Treas.: Mr. William W. Reid. Associate Secretaries: W. T. Brown, Mark Chamberlin.

Editorial Office and Office of Publication,

150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y.

Re-entered as second class matter Feb. 19, 1951, at the Postoffice at New York 11, N. Y., under the Act of August 24, 1912.

129

THE GREAT ARMS PROGRAM

A STUDY FOR THE CHRISTMAS SEASON

Words versus Deeds

While our spokesmen talk *disarmament* in Paris, our government practices *rearmament* throughout the world, and is pledged (with its somewhat reluctant allies) to continue this in increasing amounts for some years.

Spending for Guns and Armies

The amount of current US arms spending is indicated by the Friends Committee on National Legislation in its November 1 Washington Letter: "\$70 billion has been appropriated for defense, both here and abroad. The entire expenditure of the Federal Government for the first 135 years was approximately \$66 billion; approximately \$56 billion was for military purposes.

"The biggest single item voted by Congress was a record peacetime arms vote of \$56.9 billion.

"Another \$4.1 billion will be spent for construction and expansion of bases all over the globe, with the aim of surrounding Russia with bases from which war may be waged if necessary.

"Also, the Mutual Security Program this year cost \$7.3 billion for other nations' arms and armies. Less than 1/5 of this sum will go for economic aid for these countries—for the most part, to bolster their economies for greater arms production. . . .

"Another \$1.6 billion will be spent by agencies, such as Civilian Defense. . . . \$100 million may be spent for arms aid to Spain if the President wishes. Up to \$100 million of the European military aid can be used to recruit refugees from Iron Curtain countries for military units."

Despite *cuts* in civilian and welfare expenditures, Congressional spending this year surpasses last year's by \$13 billion.

Spending for Cooperation and Peace

The Friends point out that, in contrast to this unprecedented peacetime arms spending: "*Less than 1/2 of 1 per cent of all the money Congress has agreed to spend goes for U. S. contributions to all international organizations, including the United Nations, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the Pan American Union and some twenty other international agencies.*"

Spending for Children's Welfare

In this Christmas Season churchmen recall the birth of a child in a stable, the destruction of little children by Herod, and the supreme importance of child welfare for God. The Friends Committee reports on Congress: "\$12 million was asked for the UN International Children's Emergency Fund, but the Senate Bill was never reported to the House from the Foreign Affairs Committee. Unless the U. S. contributes this, UNICEF's budget will be far short of the barest needs for millions of children whose lives have been deeply affected by war or who live in the under-developed countries."

Taxes and Prices Go Up

Arms spending has seriously increased our nation's deficit (by \$10 billion this fiscal year) despite the costly rise in taxes. Both deficit and taxes will go even higher, by present Government plans. And arms spending has spurred inflation. Higher taxes mean fewer take home dollars. Higher prices make remaining dollars less valuable. The dollar is now worth 53c compared to pre-war; and the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics report shows prices and living costs at an all-time high—up 10% since Korea.

Effect of Rearmament on Our Allies

Inflation, greatly aggravated by costly rearmament, poses an even greater catastrophe for our allies. The pro-US French government is shaking. England's new Tory leaders warn of national "bankruptcy." In both countries austerity programs include government planning and action to *reduce* living standards.

The United Nations' Economic Commission for Europe, in its latest mid-1951 Economic Survey of Europe, gave due warning of this danger (see Chapter Five, "The Problem of Inflation," pages 131 ff.): "The problem is most serious in countries heavily dependent on international trade and hence susceptible to price influences from the outside. This is the position of most western European countries. . . . Clearest indication of the inflationary dangers in western Europe is given by the recent and continuing swift rise in prices. . . . Since September 1950, the upward movement of prices has increased in violence and scope: the typical increase up to early 1951 has been from two to four per cent per month for import and wholesale prices and from one to two per cent per month for cost of living. Even countries where the cost of living had previously been fairly stable, as in Sweden and the United Kingdom, or actually falling, as in Western Germany and Switzerland, have not escaped the post-Korean infection.

"Original cause of this recent wave of price increases was the rise in world demand that followed fighting in Korea. . . . Through the decision of European Governments to spend vastly more than hith-

erto on armaments. . . . further rises in retail prices are to be expected, in some cases greater than those already."

"The rise in European defense expenditure is still largely in the future, but the shadow of Europe's increased defense bill has marched before it. Increasingly since the autumn of 1950, Governments, merchants, manufacturers and consumers in Europe, as overseas, have done their best to hoard durable goods and materials expected to become scarce or to rise in price. This has been important in further driving up prices. . . . There is little reason to believe this has more than started yet. . . . Increases in one country necessarily reinforce increases in others in a trading community as active as that in Western Europe. . . .

"A number of important countries are not well placed to carry the additional claims of rearmament. . . .

"Military expenditure in 1951 seems likely to increase in several countries by as much as 50% or even more, over the 1950 ratio. For some countries of Western Europe, the total of defense expenditure will thereby be raised to around 10% of net national income, and in the United Kingdom the share will be even bigger. . . . Europe, excluding the Soviet Union, is going to spend in 1951 the equivalent of some 14 or 15 million industrial man-years on defense, or about 35% more than in 1950."

"For countries now embarking on heavy armaments programs, it is safe to conclude that . . . there may be an absolute reduction in living standards."

The inflation problem is not the same in all European countries. The same United Nations Report cites what "has become the regular practice in the Soviet Union where a series of price reductions has been decreed at the beginning of each year since 1948."

As for the other Eastern European countries the Report tells how the different governments involved have dealt with varying success with a different kind of inflationary pressure arising not from costly rearmament programs, but from the fact that "in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Roumania, the total wage bill increased from 1949 to 1950 by as much as 25 to 35%, owing both to increased employment and to higher wage rates. . . . Money incomes have tended to increase at a faster rate than can possibly have been the case with the output of consumers' goods. . . . Inflationary manifestations in Eastern European countries appear to be very different in origin and form from those found elsewhere." In these countries "inflationary pressures arose in 1950 against the general background of rising living standards, and, therefore, the disturbances were of limited scope." The exception cited was Yugoslavia, due to "decline in production while money income of wage earners remained fairly stable. The decline in agricultural production, due to a severe drought, was of the order of 25%; at the same time, the output of industrial consumers' goods increased only little from 1949 to 1950, and for textiles there was even a decline of 4%."

Arms Spending by the Rival Camps

How does our arms spending (and that of our allies) compare with that of the countries against which we arm? To what extent are the differing economies militarized? One important source of information, largely ignored by our press, is again the highly respected UN's Economic Commission for Europe (functioning for all Europe but led and largely controlled by Westerners). In its latest Survey of Europe, the Commission for the first time publishes statistical tables (Pages 136-8) on arms spending. UN table 66 reports military spending as per cent of total government spending has increased between 1949 and 1951 from 23 to 34 in England, from 6.4 to 16 in Belgium, from 21.4 to 26.1 in France, from 15.9 (1949) to 28.2 in The Netherlands, from 10.3 to 20.6 in Norway, from 10.9 to 16.8 in Yugoslavia. In the same period the percent of military expenditure in the USSR rose from 17.8 to 21.2, and in Hungary from 3.8 to 13.9. *Decreases* in per cent were reported for Poland of from 10 to 7.1 and for Czechoslovakia from 10.4 to 6.3. Military expenditure (occupation cost) for Western Germany was reported as nearly 35 per cent government expenditure in 1950, and over 30 per cent year after year for Turkey and Spain.

UN's table 67 on "Defense Expenditure Expressed in Terms of Industrial Man-Years," lists figures for both the United States and the U.S.S.R.—and for the allies of each in Europe. Thus military expenditure in thousand man years in 1949 was 8,400 in the U.S.S.R. and 4,700 in the U. S. But in 1951 this situation was already reversed: 11,400 for the U. S. and 10,200 for the U.S.S.R. Measured in "defense expenditures per thousand inhabitants," this represented increase in the Soviet Union of from 42 to 49, and in the United States of from 31 to 74.

Note: (1) A man year in the U. S. still produces considerably more than a man year in the less productive U.S.S.R. (2) The figures for 1951 military expenditure in the U. S. are based on a Congressional estimate of last February of only \$36.5 billions in military expenditures by the U. S. in 1951—a gross underestimate! (See the figures cited above by the Friends Committee on National Legislation.)

(Continued on page 35)